

Stephanie Kost

From: wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of DSBacker@newstudio.com
Sent: Thursday, October 30, 2003 4:17 PM
To: KAQuinn
Subject: FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230
<DATE> 10/30/03
<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO
<NAME> D. Stanley Backer
<CONTACT-EMAIL> DSBacker@newstudio.com
<ADDRESS1> 47 Page Road
<CITY> Newton
<STATE> MA
<ZIP> 02460
<PHONE>

<DESCRIPTION> *NPRM-02-230 Comment*

<TEXT> To the FCC: I strongly object to the adoption of any "broadcast flag" technology regulation, and I urge you to oppose it. As a tax-payer, voter, and legitimate consumer of broadcast materials, I believe it is a poorly thought out proposal, and one that would have significantly negative consequences.

I believe that the established principle of "fair use" would be hindered by such regulation, and it would likely force consumers to buy unneeded new equipment. It would also unfairly affect small manufacturers. Most of all, it is probably not an effective deterrent to the distribution of materials on the internet. If the goal is to address that issue, I believe you have an obligation to consider other means that are fair and do not penalize consumers.

Thank you for your attention.

Stephanie Kost

From: wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of jkennedy@csuchico.edu
Sent: Thursday, October 30, 2003 4:12 PM
To: KAQuinn
Subject: FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230
<DATE> 10/30/03
<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO
<NAME> John Kennedy
<CONTACT-EMAIL> jkennedy@csuchico.edu
<ADDRESS1> 1856 Devonshire Dr.
<CITY> Chico
<STATE> CA
<ZIP> 95928
<PHONE>

<DESCRIPTION> *NPRM-02-230 Comment*

<TEXT> While the MPAA isn't as bad as the RIAA (yet), the broadcast flag is a big step in the wrong direction. It would restrict what we can do today for no good reason. It has a chilling effect on innovation. It doesn't even solve the problem, and the problem it is attempting to solve really doesn't exist today.

Today, I could care less about broadcast TV because it is basically infested with commercials and has little content that I want. When I want to watch movies, I get them off the satellite a long time before I see the edited, stripped down pan-n-scan versions we see on broadcast TV.

I think that once this flag exists, pretty soon it'll be turned on all the time except maybe during the commercials. The people who say that they need the broadcast flag can perish or adapt, and I don't particularly care which.

Stephanie Kost

From: wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of noah_gibbs@yahoo.com
Sent: Thursday, October 30, 2003 4:12 PM
To: KAQuinn
Subject: FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230

<DATE> 10/30/03

<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO

<NAME> Noah Gibbs

<CONTACT-EMAIL> noah_gibbs@yahoo.com

<ADDRESS1> 43167 Newport Dr

<CITY> Fremont

<STATE> CA

<ZIP> 94538

<PHONE>

<DESCRIPTION> *NPRM-02-230 Comment*

<TEXT> As an Open Source user and programmer, I believe that it should be legal to write software for the Fair Use (in the legal sense) of software, and to modify the appliances I use on a daily basis. The Broadcast Flag is meant specifically to frustrate those interests. It is against my interests as a consumer, as a citizen, and as a supporter of freedom in the United States, and the only thing it offers in return is a chance for the members of the MPAA to make more profits. By supporting the Broadcast Flag, you are failing in your duty to the American people, myself included.

Stephanie Kost

From: wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of jmtrnka@nottingham.org
Sent: Thursday, October 30, 2003 4:12 PM
To: KAQuinn
Subject: FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230
<DATE> 10/30/03
<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO
<NAME> Jenny Trnka
<CONTACT-EMAIL> jmtrnka@nottingham.org
<ADDRESS1> 129 Percival St. NW
<CITY> Olympia
<STATE> WA
<ZIP> 98502
<PHONE>
<DESCRIPTION> *NPRM-02-230 Comment*
<TEXT> Please do not go through with the "Broadcast Flag." Technology should not be limited to "professionals" The airwaves and TV- waves-- are the peoples- lets allow them to use its technology to the fullest.

Stephanie Kost

From: wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of noah_gibbs@yahoo.com
Sent: Thursday, October 30, 2003 1:32 PM
To: outreach@nyfairuse.org
Subject: FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230

<DATE> 10/30/03

<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO

<NAME> Noah Gibbs

<CONTACT-EMAIL> noah_gibbs@yahoo.com

<ADDRESS1> 43167 Newport Dr

<CITY> Fremont

<STATE> CA

<ZIP> 94538

<PHONE>

<DESCRIPTION> *NPRM-02-230 Comment*

<TEXT> As an Open Source user and programmer, I believe that it should be legal to write software for the Fair Use (in the legal sense) of software, and to modify the appliances I use on a daily basis. The Broadcast Flag is meant specifically to frustrate those interests. It is against my interests as a consumer, as a citizen, and as a supporter of freedom in the United States, and the only thing it offers in return is a chance for the members of the MPAA to make more profits. By supporting the Broadcast Flag, you are failing in your duty to the American people, myself included.

Stephanie Kost

From: wynkoop@prd7.wynn.com on behalf of bholroyd@mindspring.com
Sent: Thursday, October 30, 2003 4:12 PM
To: KAQuinn
Subject: FCC NPRM 02-230 Comment

<PROCEEDING> 02-230
<DATE> 10/30/03
<DOCUMENT-TYPE> CO
<NAME> Elizabeth Holroyd
<CONTACT-EMAIL> bholroyd@mindspring.com
<ADDRESS1> 8920 Orange Grove Road
<CITY> Chapel Hill
<STATE> NC
<ZIP> 27516
<PHONE> (919) 933-6922
<DESCRIPTION> *NPRM-02-230 Comment*
<TEXT> Public Officials,

Freedom of speech is worthless in this day and age if the only tool allowed to the speaker is his or her own unaided, unaugmented voice. It took unfettered use of the printing press to bring about the Reformation, as the (oppression-gearred) church leaders of the day were slow to recognize how many more people could read Luther's 99 questions once copies flew from Guttenberg's press.

Today's battle is between old world content industries and the free society that nurtured that very same group. I agree with others closely watching the development digital "broadcast flag" issue, that the most essential rights and interests in a free society are those of the public and that the tools members of the society and public use for speech - our First Amendment - should not be allocated to a class of actors who set themselves above the rest of the public, with the aid of a government bureaucracy.

"Free citizens," say the concerned watchers, "are not mere consumers; they are not a separate group from so-called 'professionals.'" The stakeholders in a truly just information policy in a free society are the public, not those who would reserve special rights to control public uses of information technology."

As a voting, concerned citizen of this free country, I say: Repent! Do not give -even more- to those who already have so much; do not take from those of us who already have such stifled voices. Refuse to cater to the wealthy special interests, act instead in the interests of the people who pay your wages, who justly expect you to protect our interests rather than those of the wealthy and already privileged, those with all the voice-enhancing tools at their command.

Thank you for listening.
E. Holroyd

Stephanie Kost

From: Kristian Perez [margsboy@speakeasy.net]
Sent: Thursday, October 30, 2003 3:40 PM
To: KAQuinn
Subject: I Oppose a Broadcast Flag Mandate for Digital Television

October 30, 2003

Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Kathleen Abernathy,

I am writing to voice my opposition to any FCC-mandated adoption of "broadcast flag" technology for digital television. As a consumer and citizen, I feel strongly that such a policy would be bad for innovation, consumer rights, and the ultimate adoption of DTV.

A robust, competitive market for consumer electronics must be rooted in manufacturers' ability to innovate for their customers. Allowing movie studios to veto features of DTV-reception equipment will enable the studios to tell technologists what new products they can create. This will result in products that don't necessarily reflect what consumers like me actually want, and it could result in me being charged more money for inferior functionality.

If the FCC issues a broadcast flag mandate, I would actually be less likely to make an investment in DTV-capable receivers and other equipment. I will not pay more for devices that limit my rights at the behest of Hollywood. Please do not mandate broadcast flag technology for digital television. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Kristian Perez
27 Garibaldi St
Daly City, CA 94014
USA

Stephanie Kost

From: Bryan Westcott [bryan.w@mail.utexas.edu]
Sent: Thursday, October 30, 2003 3:03 PM
To: Michael Copps
Subject: I Oppose a Broadcast Flag Mandate for Digital Television

October 30, 2003

Commissioner Michael J. Copps
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Michael Copps,

I am writing to express my opposition to the FCC proposed "broadcast flag" technology for digital television. I believe that this technology will stifle innovation, and does not address the alleged problem of piracy. Consumers cannot explore new technology to test their "fair use" rights. If movies are leaked to the internet before they even are released in theaters, how can a technology applied only to a broadcast signal be expected to stop that piracy? This is a copyright law issue, not a technology issue.

If companies choose to not send their content without the broadcast flag, then others content providers will fill that void. I do NOT consider the capitulation of my rights to Hollywood a fair price to pay for their content.

I am just a student and I have saved money for years to purchase a state of the art HD television set that will become instantly obsolete since it cannot receive this "broadcast flag". The mandate would force honest HDTV viewers like me to pay for the broadcast flag feature, since we must purchase new equipment to receive true high definition signals that we could already receive before the mandate.

The content providers receive all the control and all the benefit from this mandate. Will they pay me the cost of replacing my current high definition television?

I believe this mandate would amount to a gross misuse on the government's monopoly on the use of force. The mandate uses the government's power to grant special privileges to the content providers at the expense of the consumer.

To borrow from a common patriotic phrase: Give me liberty or give me no content!

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Bryan Westcott
401 Little Texas Ln
Austin, TX 78745
USA

Stephanie Kost

From: Robert MacMahon [macmahon@starband.net]
Sent: Thursday, October 30, 2003 2:17 PM
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Subject: I Oppose a Broadcast Flag Mandate for Digital Television

October 30, 2003

Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Jonathan Adelstein,

I am writing to voice my opposition to any FCC-mandated adoption of "broadcast flag" technology for digital television. As a consumer and citizen, I feel strongly that such a policy would be bad for innovation, consumer rights, and the ultimate adoption of DTV.

A robust, competitive market for consumer electronics must be rooted in manufacturers' ability to innovate for their customers. Allowing movie studios to veto features of DTV-reception equipment will enable the studios to tell technologists what new products they can create. This will result in products that don't necessarily reflect what consumers like me actually want, and it could result in me being charged more money for inferior functionality.

If the FCC issues a broadcast flag mandate, I would actually be less likely to make an investment in DTV-capable receivers and other equipment. I will not pay more for devices that limit my rights at the behest of Hollywood. Please do not mandate broadcast flag technology for digital television. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Robert MacMahon
278 Old Route 116
Hinesburg, VT 05461
USA

Stephanie Kost

From: Robert Davis [MHZ@mchsi.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 30, 2003 12:11 PM
To: Michael Copps
Subject: I Oppose a Broadcast Flag Mandate for Digital Television

October 30, 2003

Commissioner Michael J. Copps
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Michael Copps,

I am writing to voice my opposition to any FCC-mandated adoption of "broadcast flag" technology for digital television. As a consumer and citizen, I feel strongly that such a policy would be bad for innovation, consumer rights, and the ultimate adoption of DTV.

A robust, competitive market for consumer electronics must be rooted in manufacturers' ability to innovate for their customers. Allowing movie studios to veto features of DTV-reception equipment will enable the studios to tell technologists what new products they can create. This will result in products that don't necessarily reflect what consumers like me actually want, and it could result in me being charged more money for inferior functionality.

If the FCC issues a broadcast flag mandate, I would actually be less likely to make an investment in DTV-capable receivers and other equipment. I will not pay more for devices that limit my rights at the behest of Hollywood. Please do not mandate broadcast flag technology for digital television. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Robert Davis
PO BOX 186
Marseilles, IL 61341
USA

Stephanie Kost

From: Ken Paulus [kpaulus@bdblawn.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 30, 2003 11:40 AM
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

Ken Paulus (kpaulus@bdblawn.com) writes:

This "broadcast flag", and copy protection for Digital TV is a very bad idea. The transition to DTV is going great. Don't mess it up. You are punishing everyone for something only a few bad people do. The Movie companies just need to go after the bad people, like the record companies are finally doing to the music downloaders. This is working. No one I know downloads music anymore. I've had DTV for over two years now and it is great. Don't mess it up! The bad people will figure a way around these flags and all the good people will have to suffer with them.

Thanks.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: 204.210.175.186
Remote IP address: 204.210.175.186

Stephanie Kost

From: Garth Faivre [gburfoot@alltel.net]
Sent: Thursday, October 30, 2003 9:36 AM
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Subject: I Oppose a Broadcast Flag Mandate for Digital Television

October 30, 2003

Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Jonathan Adelstein,

I am writing to voice my opposition to any FCC-mandated adoption of "broadcast flag" technology for digital television. As a consumer and citizen, I feel strongly that such a policy would be bad for innovation, consumer rights, and the ultimate adoption of DTV.

A robust, competitive market for consumer electronics must be rooted in manufacturers' ability to innovate for their customers. Allowing movie studios to veto features of DTV-reception equipment will enable the studios to tell technologists what new products they can create. This will result in products that don't necessarily reflect what consumers like me actually want, and it could result in me being charged more money for inferior functionality.

If the FCC issues a broadcast flag mandate, I would actually be less likely to make an investment in DTV-capable receivers and other equipment. I will not pay more for devices that limit my rights at the behest of Hollywood. Please do not mandate broadcast flag technology for digital television. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Garth Faivre
160 oak st
Meadville, PA 16335
USA

Stephanie Kost

From: Jason Krause [j_a_krause@hotmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 30, 2003 9:02 AM
To: KAQuinn
Subject: I Oppose a Broadcast Flag Mandate for Digital Television

October 30, 2003

Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Kathleen Abernathy,

I am writing to voice my opposition to any FCC-mandated adoption of "broadcast flag" technology for digital television. As a consumer and citizen, I feel strongly that such a policy would be bad for innovation, consumer rights, and the ultimate adoption of DTV.

A robust, competitive market for consumer electronics must be rooted in manufacturers' ability to innovate for their customers. Allowing movie studios to veto features of DTV-reception equipment will enable the studios to tell technologists what new products they can create. This will result in products that don't necessarily reflect what consumers like me actually want, and it could result in me being charged more money for inferior functionality.

If the FCC issues a broadcast flag mandate, I would actually be less likely to make an investment in DTV-capable receivers and other equipment. I will not pay more for devices that limit my rights at the behest of Hollywood. Please do not mandate broadcast flag technology for digital television. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Jason Krause
2650 N. Lakeview Ave #602
Chicago, IL 60614
USA

Stephanie Kost

From: Allen Campbell [asc77@adelphia.net]
Sent: Thursday, October 30, 2003 8:52 AM
To: KAQuinn
Subject: I Oppose a Broadcast Flag Mandate for Digital Television

October 30, 2003

Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Kathleen Abernathy,

I am writing to voice my opposition to any FCC-mandated adoption of "broadcast flag" technology for digital television. As a consumer and citizen, I feel strongly that such a policy would be bad for innovation, consumer rights, and the ultimate adoption of DTV.

A robust, competitive market for consumer electronics must be rooted in manufacturers' ability to innovate for their customers. Allowing movie studios to veto features of DTV-reception equipment will enable the studios to tell technologists what new products they can create. This will result in products that don't necessarily reflect what consumers like me actually want, and it could result in me being charged more money for inferior functionality.

If the FCC issues a broadcast flag mandate, I would actually be less likely to make an investment in DTV-capable receivers and other equipment. I will not pay more for devices that limit my rights at the behest of Hollywood. Please do not mandate broadcast flag technology for digital television. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Allen Campbell
126 Eclipse Ct Apt 4
Martinsburg, WV 25401
USA

Stephanie Kost

From: jerry lambert [jerrylambert@alltel.net]
Sent: Thursday, October 30, 2003 8:44 AM
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

jerry lambert (jerrylambert@alltel.net) writes:

Mister Commissioner,

It has come to my attention that you are giving consideration to a measure implementing a broadcast flag in digital broadcasts to prevent piracy.

my question to you is, have you absolutely lost your mind ? Do you know what the MPAA can do with that kind of power ?

let me give you a small example::

you are sitting at home, watching an episode of television, and it goes to commercial break. you find the commercial obnoxious and go to fast-forward through it, only you can't, because the broadcast flag that you let get implemented prevents your digital recorder from fast-forwarding through commercials. They broke your fast-forward button !

this is just one of the many ways that a broadcast flag can be used and manipulated.

I urge you to consider very carefully what you are doing to the future of america, by implementing this one, seemingly little measure.

the MPAA screams piracy, well they did back in the days of VCR's too. If they are so interested in people in Spain watching the latest episode of CSI or Smallville, maybe they should air it over there.

They said that they will not air digital broadcasts without this protection, they already are !

Please dont give the MPAA (they are the ones behind this, no matter who it seems to be coming from) this kind of control over my television. It is neither wanted, or needed.

thanks for your time,
Jerry Lambert

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 69.40.42.142
Remote IP address: 69.40.42.142

Stephanie Kost

From: Jim Quinn [jimq@digitaledgeproductions.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 30, 2003 5:33 AM
To: KAQuinn
Subject: I Oppose a Broadcast Flag Mandate for Digital Television

October 30, 2003

Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Kathleen Abernathy,

I am writing to voice my opposition to any FCC-mandated adoption of "broadcast flag" technology for digital television. As a consumer and citizen, I feel strongly that such a policy would be bad for innovation, consumer rights, and the ultimate adoption of DTV.

A robust, competitive market for consumer electronics must be rooted in manufacturers' ability to innovate for their customers. Allowing movie studios to veto features of DTV-reception equipment will enable the studios to tell technologists what new products they can create. This will result in products that don't necessarily reflect what consumers like me actually want, and it could result in me being charged more money for inferior functionality.

If the FCC issues a broadcast flag mandate, I would actually be less likely to make an investment in DTV-capable receivers and other equipment. I will not pay more for devices that limit my rights at the behest of Hollywood. Please do not mandate broadcast flag technology for digital television. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Jim Quinn
7013 William Wallace Way
Austin, TX 78754
USA

Stephanie Kost

From: adam hopkins [hoppy@bigpond.net.au]
Sent: Thursday, October 30, 2003 4:51 AM
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Subject: I Oppose a Broadcast Flag Mandate for Digital Television

October 30, 2003

Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Jonathan Adelstein,

I am writing to voice my opposition to any FCC-mandated adoption of "broadcast flag" technology for digital television. As a consumer and citizen, I feel strongly that such a policy would be bad for innovation, consumer rights, and the ultimate adoption of DTV.

A robust, competitive market for consumer electronics must be rooted in manufacturers' ability to innovate for their customers. Allowing movie studios to veto features of DTV-reception equipment will enable the studios to tell technologists what new products they can create. This will result in products that don't necessarily reflect what consumers like me actually want, and it could result in me being charged more money for inferior functionality.

If the FCC issues a broadcast flag mandate, I would actually be less likely to make an investment in DTV-capable receivers and other equipment. I will not pay more for devices that limit my rights at the behest of Hollywood. Please do not mandate broadcast flag technology for digital television. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

adam hopkins
52 lawless drive
cranbourne, 3977
Australia